

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 8-12 are pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3 and 8-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerpheide et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,680,731) in view of Gerpheide (U.S. Patent No. 5,861,875) and further in view of Taylor et al. (U.S. Pre-Grant Pub. No. 2003/0025679). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Notwithstanding, in order to expedite prosecution of the present application, Applicants have elected to amend independent claims 1 and 8 in order to more fully distinguish the present application. Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite an input device "wherein a protrusion dimension of a portion of the insulating layer which overlaps the extension section is shorter than a protrusion dimension of the extension section such that the insulating layer does not overlap an end portion of the lead wiring of the X and Y electrodes bundled in the extension section". Independent claim 8 has been amended to incorporate similar features as independent claim 1. These features allow the electrodes to be directly connected to the non-flexible circuit layer, thereby contributing to the reduced size of the entire apparatus. In addition, the direct connection obviates the need to provide extended wiring, reducing cost and the number of manufacturing steps. At a minimum, the proposed combination does not teach these features.

The Office Action primarily relies on '731 Patent. However, the Office Action, at page 4, concedes that the '731 patent does not discuss the specific use of insulating layers and seeks to supplement the deficiencies with the '875 patent. The Office Action, at page 5, also concedes that the '731 and '875 combination does not disclose "wherein the Y electrodes are connected to the lead wiring via a through-hole part provided on the insulating layer." The Office Action seeks to supplement the deficiencies of the '731 and '875 combination with Taylor. Applicants respectfully submit that the '731-'875-Taylor combination fails to teach or suggest an input device "wherein the protrusion dimension of a portion of the insulating layer which overlaps the extension section is shorter than the protrusion dimension of the extension section such that the insulating layer does not overlap an end portion of the lead wiring of the X and Y electrodes bundled in the extension section." The '875 patent discloses that "flat electrode strips 130 are present on the top and bottom of a separator insulating substrate". ('875 patent, col. 7, lines 66-67). "On the top surface of electrode pad 20 is a thin overlay insulator 380 which prevents a sensed object from making electrical contact with electrode strips 130 and substrate 370." ('875 patent, col. 8, lines 1-4). However, the '875 patent is silent with regards to an extension section being partially covered by the insulating layer.

Taylor also fails to remedy the deficiencies of the '875 patent. Taylor discloses that a "base substrate has a first electrode grid layer 62 disposed thereon. The next layer is a dielectric insulating material 64 that is well known to those skilled in the art. Then a second electrode grid 66 is disposed on top of the dielectric insulating material 64." (Taylor, paragraph 0064). Taylor further teaches that the two electrode grids are

coupled together. (Taylor, paragraph 0063). However, as with the '875 patent, Taylor is silent as to disclosing that the end portions of the electrodes on an extension section are not overlapped by the insulating layer.

Thus, Applicants believe that independent claim 1 patentability distinguishes over the prior art. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that independent claims 1 and 8 are patentably distinct from the combination of references proposed by the Office Action. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections against independent claims 1 and 8 and their respective dependent claims be removed.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney to expedite allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gustavo Siller, Jr./
Gustavo Siller, Jr.
Registration No. 32,305
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200